

### **Remarks**

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed August 13, 2003 and the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment mailed December 11, 2003. Claims 1 to 23 are pending. Claims 1, 11, 13, 15, and 21-23 are amended. As indicated claims 21-23 were originally presented as claims 22-24 but renumbered because no claim 20 was presented. The amendments to claims 22 and 23 correspond to correction of the dependency due to the renumbering. The Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 18 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants have changed the status indicator from “amended” to “currently amended” as requested in the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment.

### **112 Rejections**

Claims 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Applicants erroneously stated that the twist angle of the aligned liquid crystal layer was smaller than that of the same layer. The error in the language of claims 11 and 13 was inadvertent. The Applicants have corrected this error and amended claims 11 and 13 based on the specification as suggested in the Office Action. The Applicants request withdrawal of this rejection. This amendment is not made in view of any prior art rejection.

### **§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by British Patent Application 2,326,727 (hereinafter “’727 Application”). Claims 21 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘727 Application. Claims 15-17, 20, and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘727 Application in view of British Patent Application 2,324,881 (hereinafter “’881 Application”). The Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 15, and 21 to clarify that the article being made is a film. Neither of the cited references teaches or suggests making a film according

to the methods recited in the claims. In each of the cited references, the constructions referenced in the Office Action are formed on substrates (for example, reference numbers 1 and 11 of the Figures in the '727 Application and reference number 10 of Figures 1-4 and 7-11 of the '881 Application) made of a material such as glass. There are a number of advantages to having a single film containing both a polarizer and a polarization rotator. For example, such a film can be manufactured, stored, and shipped as roll-goods. These roll-goods can then be cut or converted as desired. For at least these reasons, claims 1-17 and 20-22 are patentable over the cited references. The Applicants request withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested. Allowance of claims 1-23, as amended, at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dec. 29, 2003  
Date

By: B. E. Black  
Bruce E. Black, Reg. No.: 41,622  
Telephone No.: (651) 736-3366

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833